

Dynamics of Inhomogeneous Tomonaga-Luttinger Liquid Wire

V.V.Ponomarenko

Frontier Research Program, RIKEN, Wako-Shi, Saitama 351-01, JAPAN.

*Permanent address: A.F.Ioffe Physical Technical Institute,
194021, St. Petersburg, Russia.*

Dynamics of the 1D electron transport between two reservoirs are studied based on the inhomogeneous Tomonaga- Luttinger Liquid (ITLL) model in the case when the effect of the electron backscattering on the impurities is negligible. The inhomogeneities of the interaction lead to a charge wave reflection. This effect supposes a special behavior of the transport characteristics at the microwave frequencies. New features are predicted in the current noise spectrum and in the a.c. current- frequency dependence. Knowledge of them may be very useful to identify experimental setup with the one specified by the ITLL model.

PACS numbers:72.10Bg, 72.15-v, 73.20Dx

The effect of the electron-electron interaction has been suggested to be especially important for 1D electron transport through a few channel wire [1]. Such a wire is generally believed in view of the results of the 1D field theory [2] to be described as a Tomonaga-Luttinger Liquid. A number of authors [3] developed this approach making it closer to experimental reality. Recently a new modification has been suggested [4], [5], [6] to cope with the effect of a finite length of the quantum wire. It supposes that the 1D transport through the quantum wire of finite length may be described by the Tomonaga-Luttinger Liquid model with an inhomogeneous constant of the interaction. The model meets a natural demand of the unrenormalizableness of the zero-frequency conductance by the interaction. It has also found agreement with a recent experiment [7] where the tracks of the interaction effect predicted before [8] were allegedly observed. Therefore it looks tempting to search for further consequences of this model which could be useful in comparing with the experimental results.

This paper is aimed at analyzing the simplest dynamical features of the 1D transport following from the inhomogeneous Tomonaga-Luttinger Liquid (ITLL) model in the case when the effect of the electron backscattering on the impurities is negligible. Such a situation seems to be easily reachable via proper tuning of the gate voltage [7], governing the depth of the potential well forming the wire. In this system an electron travels from one reservoir to the other without reflection. The inhomogeneities of the interaction, however, vary velocity and charge of the charge wave excitations, what may be interpreted as a charge wave reflection [5]. This effect can lead to a special behavior of the transport characteristics at microwave frequencies. To study this behavior I will impose two restriction on the transport experiment in the two probe geometry in addition to the above condition of the absence of the backscattering and the adiabatical joint with the reservoirs: i) the interaction between electrons in the wire is local since a gate electrode located near the wire screens the Coulomb interaction between the wire electrons at the distances more than the range of the order of the width of the wire which is much less than the length L of the wire; ii) current entering a reservoir from the 1D conductor is immediately transferred to the attached lead

whereupon the current operator evaluated at the end of the 1D wire will give the experimentally observed value. This is valid as charge redistribution in the leads is of a much higher frequency than the frequencies that will be discussed. Having in mind the GaAs structure one can reckon that the width of the wire is several hundred angstroms, its length is about $2\text{ }\mu\text{m}$, the Fermi velocity v is about 10^{-5} m/sec , and the frequency, corresponding to the traversal time t_L , is $\approx 1K$.

The transport through such a system with the one spin-degenerate channel wire can be described, following [6], and also [4], [5], with the Lagrangian ($\hbar = 1$)

$$\mathcal{L}_t = \frac{v}{8\pi} \int dx \left[\frac{1}{v^2} (\partial_t \phi(t, x))^2 - u^2(x) (\partial_x \phi(x, t))^2 \right] + \frac{e}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int dy \phi(t, y) \partial_y V(t, y) \quad (1)$$

$$u^2(x) = (1 + 2\varphi(x)U/(v\pi))$$

The bosonic field ϕ corresponding to the charge wave excitations are connected with the operator of the electron density as $\rho = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \partial_x \phi$ and with the operator of the electron current as $j = -\frac{e}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \partial_t \phi$ due to a bosonization procedure [2]. v is the Fermi velocity, and the local density-density interaction $\varphi(x)U$ between the electrons is switched on in between the points $x = 0$ and $x = L$, where the channel adiabatically joins the reservoirs.

The second part of the Lagrangian includes the applied electric field equal to $-\partial_y V(t, y)$. In general, it makes the problem a non-equilibrium one. Following a standard procedure [9] one should calculate any physical quantity as a functional average of the appropriate function of ϕ with the $\exp\{i\mathcal{S}(\phi)\}$ weight, where the action $S(\phi)$ is the integral of $\mathcal{L}_t$ over Schwinger's contour from $-\infty$ to ∞ and back. With the Gaussian form of the Lagrangian the second term in (1) may be excluded due to shifting of ϕ by $\langle \phi(t, x) \rangle = (1/v) \int dt' \int dy G(t - t', x, y) (-\partial_y V(t', y))$. Here $G(t, x, y)$ is the retarded Green function, whose Fourier transform satisfies

$$\left[\frac{\omega^2}{v^2} + \partial_x u^2(x) \partial_x \right] G(x, y, \omega) = \delta(x - y) \quad (2)$$

After the shift of ϕ all calculations can be done with the equilibrium Lagrangian.

In this way of calculation one can find that the current $\langle j(t, x) \rangle$ is always linearly connected with the voltage in this model (it is not surprising in view of the linearized

dispersion law of the TLL model), and the conductivity per spin channel is $\sigma(x, y, \omega) = \frac{e^2}{\pi v} i\omega G(x, y, \omega)$. Another useful consequence is that the current-current correlator at the steady voltage distribution

$$P(x, \omega) = \int dt e^{i\omega t} (\frac{1}{2} \langle [j(x, t), j(x, 0)]_+ \rangle - \langle j(x, 0)^2 \rangle) = 2 \coth(\frac{\beta\omega}{2}) \omega \text{Re} \sigma(x, x, \omega) \quad (3)$$

does not depend on the voltage. Hence, it can be represented due to the fluctuation-dissipation theorem as the real part of the conductivity $\sigma(x, x, \omega)$. $\beta = T^{-1}$ is the inverse temperature.

The conductivity may be constructed from the two independent solutions of the homogeneous Eq. (2), corresponding to a charge wave coming from the left(right) side $f_{\pm\omega}(x) = t(\omega) \exp \pm i(\omega/v)x$ at $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$, ($t(\omega) = t(-\omega)$ are the amplitudes of the transmission) as [6]

$$\sigma(x, y, \omega) = \frac{e^2}{2\pi t(\omega)} [f_{+\omega}(x) f_{-\omega}(y) \theta(x - y) + f_{+\omega}(y) f_{-\omega}(x) \theta(y - x)] \quad (4)$$

In the limit $\omega \rightarrow 0$ the conductivity becomes constant [4], [5], [6] equal to the universal conductance $\sigma_0 = e^2/(2\pi)$ since the only restricted solution of the homogeneous Eq. (2) at $\omega = 0$ is constant.

For further consideration it is important that $u(x)$ may be approached by a step function as only excitation of the waves of the electron density with small k (in comparison with the inverse width of the channel and with the inverse distance to the screening gate, but not with the inverse length of the wire L^{-1}) is essential. In this case the solutions of the homogeneous Eq. (2) take the form

$$f_{+\omega}(x) = \begin{cases} e^{ix\omega/v} + r(\omega)e^{-ix\omega/v}, & x < 0 \\ t(\omega)e^{iL\omega/v} [a_+ e^{i(x-L)\omega/v'} + a_- e^{-i(x-L)\omega/v'}], & 0 < x < L \\ t(\omega)e^{ix\omega/v}, & L < x \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

$$f_{-\omega}(x) = \begin{cases} t(\omega)e^{-ix\omega/v}, & x < 0 \\ t(\omega) [a_+ e^{-ix\omega/v'} + a_- e^{ix\omega/v'}], & 0 < x < L \\ e^{-ix\omega/v} + r(\omega)e^{i(x-2L)\omega/v}, & L < x \end{cases}$$

$$t(\omega) = \frac{e^{-iL\omega/v}}{\cos(\omega t_L) - i\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{u} + u)\sin(\omega t_L)}, \quad r(\omega) = \frac{-i\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{u} - u)\sin(\omega t_L)}{\cos(\omega t_L) - i\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{u} + u)\sin(\omega t_L)} \quad (6)$$

where $a_{\pm} = (1 \pm u^{-1})/2$, u is the meaning of the function $u(x)$ inside the wire ($u = u(L/2)$), $v' = vu$ and $t_L = L/v'$ are the velocity and the traveling time of the elementary charge excitation of the wire. First let me calculate the current noise spectra for the current coming into the right reservoir $J_R(t) = j(L+0, t)$ and for the current outgoing from the left reservoir $J_L(t) = j(-0, t)$. In fact, both spectra coincide and are equal to

$$P(-0, \omega) = P(L+0, \omega) = \sigma_0 \omega \left(1 - \frac{1}{4} \frac{(u^2 - u^{-2}) \sin^2(\omega t_L)}{\cos^2(\omega t_L) + (u + u^{-1})^2 / 4 \sin^2(\omega t_L)} \right) \quad (7)$$

for $1/\beta = T \ll \omega \approx 1/t_L$. This result shows (fig.1) that a linear dependence of the free electron noise spectrum [10] is modulated by the oscillating factor with the period equal to π/t_L .

Another way to probe dynamics of the transport at the frequencies $\geq \pi/t_L$ is making use of a microwave electro-magnetic radiation. Below I will examine its effect on the frequency dependence of the amplitude of the left and right lead currents. The radiation acts on the system by varying both the chemical potentials and by accelerating the charge waves inside the 1D wire. The resultant effect can be specified with the effective electro-chemical potential as

$$-\partial_x V(x, t) = \cos(\omega t) [V_L \delta(x) + V_R \delta(x - L) + E \theta(x) \theta(L - x)] \quad (8)$$

where $\delta(x)$ and $\theta(x)$ denote Dirac's delta and Heaviside's step functions, respectively. Since these three terms have a different origin I first will consider them separately.

The V_L term in (8) pertains to such an experiment when the chemical potential of the right lead is fixed, say $\mu_R = 0$, and the chemical potential of the left lead is driven by the microwave radiation imposed between the left lead and the ground electrode somewhere far from the wire. Then the amplitudes of the right J_{Rc} and left J_{Lc} currents may be calculated as

$$J_{Rc} = 2V_L \sigma_0 |t(\omega)| = \frac{2V_L \sigma_0}{\sqrt{\cos^2(\omega t_L) + (u + 1/u)^2 / 4 \sin^2(\omega t_L)}} \\ J_{Lc} = 2V_L \sigma_0 |1 + r(\omega)| = 2V_L \sigma_0 \sqrt{2 - \frac{1 + (u^2 - 1/u^2)/2 \sin^2(\omega t_L)}{\cos^2(\omega t_L) + (u + 1/u)^2 / 4 \sin^2(\omega t_L)}} \quad (9)$$

It reveals that both amplitudes oscillate around the constant signal of their free electron behavior (Fig.1) with the period π/t_L . Their variations are characterized by the declination of their minimums, reached at ω equal to *halfinteger* $\times \pi/t_L$, from $2V_L\sigma_0$. The minimums are $4V_L\sigma_0/(u+1/u)$ and $4V_L\sigma_0/(u+1/u)/u$ for the right and left lead current, respectively. Fig.1 depicts dependence of the normalized amplitudes $J_{L(R)c}/(2V_L\sigma_0)$ on the frequency. It shows that for the small interaction ($u = 1.43$ was taken to accord with [7]) the normalized amplitude of the left lead current (full line) turns out to be very close to the normalized noise signal $P(\omega)/(2\sigma_0\coth(\beta\omega/2))$ (dotted line).

The above oscillations results from the scattering of the charge waves on the places of the interaction inhomogeneity. It is better seen from the time dependence of $J_R(t)$ produced by a sudden jump of the chemical potential of the left reservoir, what corresponds to the switching on of the voltage as $V_L(t) = V_L\theta(t)$. This current reply may be calculated [5] as

$$J_R(t) = 2V_L\sigma_0 i \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \frac{t(\omega)e^{i\omega L/v}}{\omega + i0} = 2V_L\sigma_0\theta(t) \left\{ 1 - \left(\frac{u-1}{u+1} \right)^{2\text{int}[(t/t_L+1)/2]} \right\} \quad (10)$$

where $\text{int}[x]$ equals the integer part of x , and $(u-1)/(u+1)$ is the reflection coefficient. The first step of the current-time staircase dependence of Eq. (10) appears for $t \geq t_L$, the second one for $t \geq 3t_L$ and so on.

Another experimental situation arises when the radiation acts on the electrons only inside the wire. Surmising that the electric field E parallel to the channel is uniformly distributed along the length L , one can write the right lead current as $J_R = 2E | \int_0^L dy \sigma(L, y, \omega) | \cos(\omega t - \arg\{ \int_0^L dy \sigma(L, y, \omega) \})$. Its amplitude can be found as

$$\frac{J_{Rc}}{2EL\sigma_0} = \frac{\sin(\omega t_L/2)}{\omega t_L/2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{u^2} \right)} \sqrt{\frac{1 + \frac{u^2-1}{u^2+1} \cos(\omega t_L)}{\cos^2(\omega t_L) + (u+1/u)^2/4 \sin^2(\omega t_L)}} \quad (11)$$

The first multiplier on the right side (11) displays the signal in the free electron case (t_L is renormalized by the interaction). It becomes π/t_L periodically modulated by the interaction term. The whole signal quickly vanishes with increase of the frequency (Fig.2).

Turning to a general situation one can represent the amplitude of the current coming into the right electrode as

$$J_{Rc}(\omega) = 2\sigma_0|V_L t(\omega)e^{iL\omega/v} + V_R(1 + r(\omega)) + E\frac{iv}{\omega}(1 - r(\omega) - t(\omega)e^{iL\omega/v})| \quad (12)$$

This expression displays a ravelled dependence of the amplitude on the frequency (Fig.2). Simplification comes, however, with increase of the frequency, where only abrupt steps of the electro-chemical potential near the edges of the electrodes contribute substantially. Finally, Eq. (12) at $\omega t_L \gg 1$ takes the form

$$\left(\frac{J_{Rc}(\omega)}{2\sigma_0}\right)^2 = 2V_R^2 + \frac{2V_L V_R \cos(\omega t_L) + V_L^2 - V_R^2 - 1/2V_R^2(u^2 - 1/u^2)\sin^2(\omega t_L)}{\cos^2(\omega t_L) + (u + 1/u)^2/4\sin^2(\omega t_L)} \quad (13)$$

The $2\pi/t_L$ periodical oscillations already exist in the free electron case if both chemical potentials of the left and right electrodes are rotated simultaneously. In the interacting wire the π/t_L periodical oscillations additionally appear, which deform the simple *cos* law behavior of the free electron dependence. The case displayed in Fig.2 corresponds to the asymmetrical distribution of the electro-chemical potential ($V_L/V = 0.15, V_R/V = 0.35$, where V is the whole variation).

In summary, the effect of the inhomogeneities of the electron-electron interaction on the current noise spectrum and on the a.c. current amplitude was identified in the microwave frequency range. The current noise spectrum turns out to be modulated by the oscillating factor with period π/t_L due to the inhomogeneous interaction. The a.c.current behavior depends on the distribution of the electro-chemical potential produced by the microwave radiation. In the case of a non-zero V_L and/or V_R the amplitude oscillates in a wide range of the frequency with the period equal to $2\pi/t_L$ in the general case and to π/t_L if $V_L V_R = 0$. These signals give a way to identify the effect of the interaction in the experiment on 1D electron transport. The microwave field accelerating electrons along the 1D conductor results in the signal quickly disappearing with increase of the frequency. Extraction of the π/t_L oscillating fraction of it looks especially challenging.

I am very grateful to K. K. Likharev for elucidative discussions and to M. Stopa for useful comments and kind help. The interest of A. Kawabata and S. Tarucha is much appreciated. This work was supported by the STA.

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Dependences of the normalized spectrum of the current noise (curve 1, dotted) and of the amplitudes of the right (curve 2, dash-double-dot) and left (curve 3, full) lead current for the inetraction parameter $u = 1.43$ corresponding to the experiment [7]. The spectrum $P(\omega)$ is normalized as $P(\omega)/(2\sigma_0 \coth(\beta\omega/2))$, $\sigma_0 = e^2/(2\pi)$, where β is the inverse temperature. The normalization of both current amplitudes $J_{R(L)c}$ was suggested $J_c/(2V_L\sigma_0)$, where V_L is the amplitude of oscillation of the chemical potential of the left lead.

FIG. 2. Plot of the normalized amplitude of the right current vs ω in the case when the drop of the potential is inside the 1D wire (full curve 1) $V_L = V_R = 0$, and in the general case for $V_L/V_R/(EL) = 0.15/0.35/0.5$ (dotted line). In the latter case the signal is approaching its steady behavior (full line 2) with increase of the frequency.

REFERENCES

- [1] C.L.Kane and M.P.A.Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett **68**, 1220 (1992); Phys. Rev. B **46**, 15233 (1992).
- [2] E. Fradkin, 1991, *Field Theories of Condensed Matter Systems*, (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley).
- [3] A. Furusaki and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 4631 (1993); K.A.Matveev, D.Yue and L.I.Glazman, Phys. Rev. Let. **71**, 3351(1993); K.A.Matveev and L.I.Glazman, Phys. Rev. Let. **70**, 990 (1993); A.Kawabata, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. Jpn.**63**, 2047 (1994); J. Appl. Phys. **34**, 4288(1995).
- [4] D.L.Maslov and M. Stone, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R5539 (1995).
- [5] I.Safi and H.J.Schulz, cond-mat/9505079.
- [6] V.V.Ponomarenko, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R8666 (1995).
- [7] S.Tarucha, T.Honda and T. Saku, Sol. St. Comm. **94**, 413 (1995).
- [8] M.Ogata and H.Fukuyama, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 468 (1994); D.M.Maslov, cond-mat/9507119.
- [9] J. Schwinger, J. Math. Phys. **2**, 407 (1961); L.V.Keldysh, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.**47**, 1515 (1964).
- [10] S.-R. Yang, Sol. St. Comm. **94**, 413 (1995).



